

I think the procedure is: you have to get comments from two people approved by either Bette or me. You have to receive what they say, but you don't have to obey their instructions. Then you can put it out as a working paper. So you seem to be cleared.

If it's not too presumptuous to make a general remark, I wish you wrote as clearly as you speak. I don't like the clever style.

0206 82193

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF VALUE AND THE VALUE OF POLITICAL
ECONOMY : AN ESSAY IN HONOUR OF MAURICE DOBB¹

By

BEN FINE

Birkbeck College

¹ Paper to be presented at a Day School in Honour of Dobb,
January 22nd, 1977 at Warwick University.

The Political Economy of Value and the Value of Political Economy:

An Essay in Honour of Maurice Dobb¹

INTRODUCTION

This essay attempts to assess the role played by value theory in Maurice Dobb's political economy and, somewhat ambitiously, locates the development of value theory in socialist political economy over the past forty years. Whatever impact political economy has had on the labour movement in this country, I take it as uncontroversial that Maurice Dobb's contribution to it is the most outstanding and indeed unique. Less generally accepted may be the view that this impact has been positive. For, whilst the development of political economy sympathetic to socialism must always appear progressive when seen in isolation from other social forces, Marxism must assess political economy in relation to these wider and more fundamental considerations. It could be argued, for example, that an apparently progressive political economy is merely the reflection of a political commitment that confines the intensification and advance of working class struggle. Here we have the classic dichotomy between theory and practice. Theory is not right or wrong, but must be judged in relation to social practice, according to its sphere of influence. The sacrifice in exposition of the principles of the purest theory may be necessary to make any impact during periods of underdeveloped class-consciousness. On the other hand, until we have understood the origins of such a situation, these sacrifices may be deemed to be self-imposed, the very product of the limitation of class struggle in political practice. More specifically, we must admire Dobb's courageous commitment to Marxism and the Communist Party from the isolation of the inter-war period through the subsequent Cold War. As we shall see, he has left a heritage of political economy which is the starting point for the Marxism of today. But

*Obscurely
worded.*

*Just because of the way it's expressed / And it's terribly²
hard to understand this paragraph.*

why we should be beginning with that heritage (and Dobb's major contribution to it) cannot be explained independently of the dynamic of class struggle. If we judge, in the Trotskyist tradition, that the Communist Party has delayed the forces of revolution, it becomes otiose to praise Dobb for his political economy. Rather, it becomes necessary to reveal his theory as a reflection and support of Communist Party strategy, and this would conform to the tendency for Trotskyism to have a "revolutionary theory" reflecting its "revolutionary practice".

These observations will become clearer I hope as the essay proceeds. I raise them, however, only to ignore them (or more exactly to prevent being out-flanked from the left), for I cannot here deal with the history of the labour movement, its theory and ideology. What I can do is identify the movements in the political economy of value, and discover in a limited way how these changes, at a given level of class consciousness, allow the labour movement to advance. In the first section of the essay, I argue that Dobb, until recently, adopted a Ricardian concept of value but that this gave way to a distinct neo-Ricardian concept. Since in section II, I argue that this is a theoretically and practically regressive step, I devote considerable attention in section I to attacking neo-Ricardianism, of which Dobb was only a partial representative in later years. This should not be taken as an attack on Dobb's contribution to political economy, which derives from his earlier period when, as I explain in section II, the conditions of ideological and political and economic struggle were different. (Dobb's contribution is also seriously underestimated by only considering value theory.) Thus, there are two changes to assess: Dobb's movement to neo-Ricardianism and the conditions in which theory operates.

But even, now, don't you think, with exchange-value as a form of the commodity, quite apart from its connection with labour. The commodity has split into two, with its ^{as} exchange-value separate from itself. Certainly I agree that the quantitative quantity of labour time is unimportant. In fact, I would say that Marx was so little concerned with it that, by default as it were, he took it over from Ricardo without question. So this is a sideways reason for taking Ricardo's value theory as identical with an (unimportant) part of Marx's.

I. The Political Economy of Value

There can be little doubt that Maurice Dobb's contribution to value theory has been consistently Ricardian socialist. In a way, he explicitly recognises this in his acknowledgement of the debt that he owes to the work of P. Sraffa, the followers of whom have been dubbed neo-Ricardian. What is peculiar in this is that Dobb, a scholar of Marxism, has consistently failed to distinguish the value theories of Ricardo and Marx. On the contrary, Dobb has persistently referred to the labour theory of value of Ricardo and Marx, or even the Ricardo-Marx theory of value.

A careful reading of Chapter 1 of Capital I demonstrates, however, that Marx is less concerned with the Ricardian quantification of labour-time as the basis for a theory of distribution and price than with understanding exchange-value as the form in which labour-time exerted in production makes its appearance in a commodity producing society. Indeed, the three volumes of Capital can be seen in part as a structure of analysis which fills in with greater detail the slips between the cup of production and the lip of exchange. Volume I reveals the method by which surplus value is produced. Volume II integrates this process of production with the process of exchange. Finally, Volume III reintegrates these two processes to form a theory of production, circulation and distribution, creating a theory of price and the forms of surplus value in exchange. Thus, in Volume I production and exchange are present, but the details of their articulation are not explored until Volume II, and similarly for distribution in Volume III. Yet, even if we restrict ourselves to the first chapter of Capital, how can we fail to recognise Marx's preoccupation with the form of value? How else are we to interpret Marx's detailed analysis of the two-fold character of commodities and the two-fold character of labour, as use value and exchange value, that is embodied

within them? Significantly, consideration of the distinction (and of unity)/abstract and concrete labour is most noticeable for its absence from the neo-Ricardian theory of value².

But it would be incorrect to identify Marx's theory with Ricardo's even in the hands of neo-Ricardians. *I don't understand.* For Dobb, with his emphasis on the requirements of a theory of value, the labour theory of value depends upon the use to which it is put³. Marx's achievement is to reveal capital's mode of exploiting labour by discovering the differentia specifica of capitalism: that labour-power is a commodity. Surplus value and consequently profit exist because of the value of labour-power and the labour-time exerted by the labourer. Consequently the labour theory of value, as a first approximation to a theory of price, is acceptable because it shows something -- the "sociology" of capitalist exploitation -- more clearly than a more developed theory of price can do. This is a theoretical position of some weakness, for it restricts "the labour theory of value" to a sociology of exploitation and strips it of any other analytical significance other than as a first approximation. It further suggests that if the second or higher order approximations are consistent with the first order, they are superior except for simpletons. On the other hand, if the higher order approximations are inconsistent with their ancestors, this simply means that the latter are wrong. Dobb (1973, p.148) too readily dismisses as a "light-hearted retort" Samuelson's (1966, p.348) observation that strikes at the heart of Dobb's ambiguous commitment to the labour theory of value and neo-Ricardianism: "modern science and economics abound with simplifying first approximations, but one readily admits their inferiority to second approximations, and drops them when challenged"⁴. This, of course, is the basis on which Samuelson (1974) can, in the context of the transformation problem, dismiss values as an unnecessary analytical diversion. The strength of his position

relative to Dobb's can be judged by the fact that the "advanced" neo-Ricardian "Marxists" take up Samuelson's cudgels and beat their neo-Ricardian concept of the labour theory of value to death⁵.

To redress the balance of this discussion in Marx's favour, it must be pointed out that the above method of approximation bears no relation to his method of dialectical abstraction. As Marx lays out in the Grundrisse, his "method of approximation" is to construct more complex and concrete concepts on the basis of abstract ones in the process of reproducing the real world in theory. Consequently, value is not a first approximation to price nor are organic compositions of capital assumed equal in Volume I, as Dobb frequently insists. Rather, the abstraction that commodities exchange at their values is one that allows the anatomy of production to be dissected with only the ghostly intervention of exchange⁶. As we have already indicated, this is the basis for developing a more complex and concrete analysis of the capitalist economy, by specifying the relationships between production, circulation and distribution. For the object of the exercise is not the construction of a theory of wage, price profit nor even of exploitation, but to discover the relationship between producers^{and}/exploiters: the process whereby the exertion of labour in the factories of the economy creates the categories of price, wage profit, interest and rent as the form of that concrete labour in exchange. To treat value as a first approximation to price is to cut the heart out of the Marxist critique of capitalism and political economy for it suspends distribution and exchange in isolation from the process of production by discarding the latter.

These observations are far from being novel, for Marx took great pains to assess and criticise Ricardo's concept of value. These criticisms have enjoyed a revival themselves in response to the rise of neo-Ricardianism. Essentially they can be classified into two distinct

Really? Is this why Marx called Ricardo scientific? Have you the
textual evidence? This surprises me.

but related types, but they all are based on the failure of Ricardianism to distinguish value and its source from its form. First there are those errors that are ^{induced?} induced within the Ricardian system but which are not intrinsic to it. These are extremely specific and can even be defended as genuine differences of abstraction. For example, there are the Ricardian failures to admit the possibility of lengthening the working day and the existence of absolute rent, also the classical distinction between fixed and circulating (as opposed to constant and variable) capital, and its conceptualisation of productive and unproductive labour. To my mind these criticisms comprise a brilliant excursion into the history of economic thought, revealing how partial conceptualisations are induced by particular modes of thought which are in turn based on a partial comprehension of capital. But they are rarely devastatingly effective because they only apply in specific instances and can be met by modifying the Ricardian scheme or defending it as a more appropriate abstraction of reality.

Secondly, at a more general level, Marxism criticises Ricardianism for its method. Whilst Dobb constantly supports his concept of the Ricardo-Marx theory of value by reference to Marx's praise of Ricardo as a scientific political economist, he fails to explain adequately Marx's fuller reference to Ricardo as the representative of bourgeois scientific political economy par excellence. Briefly, Ricardo is scientific because of his dogged commitment to the labour theory of value despite its inconsistency with a developed theory of market price. Unconsciously he retains the economic category specific to capitalist commodity production - abstract labour-time as represented by value. Yet it is this very lack of consciousness that makes Ricardo's theory bourgeois and leads him to make the mistakes exemplified in the previous paragraph. For, other than the concept of value itself, Ricardo analyses appearance in exchange alone, making no attempt

to understand the historically specific categories of wages, prices and profits as forms of value. Nevertheless, Ricardo's labour theory of value and his understanding of the distribution of profit according to capital advanced involved a contradiction, the so-called transformation problem, that could not be solved whilst retaining both the bourgeois and scientific character of his theory. Ricardo's contradiction can be seen as the source of two schools of economic thought. Marx's scientific socialism abolishes the bourgeois elements of Ricardo by rooting out the distinction between value and its form and constructing a theory of distribution and exchange on the basis of production. In contrast, vulgar political economy abandons the labour theory of value, and preoccupies itself with appearance. It is bourgeois and unscientific even if sympathetic to socialism as in the case of neo-Ricardianism.

These remarks can best be illustrated by assessing what I take to be the two central propositions of Dobb's (1973) most recent contribution to the theory of value: that the neo-Ricardian theory is a theory of distribution before it is a theory of price in the sense that prices respond to a predetermined distribution and that such a cost of production theory is an obstacle and alternative to a demand based theory with its methodology of individualism and atomisation. Consider the first proposition. If we write down the equations of the neo-Ricardian system it appears as if wages, prices and profits are determined simultaneously with one more unknown than number of equations (subject to numeraire). Dobb has already argued, however, that equations tell us nothing about direction of causation. Since the system can be reduced to an inverse relation between the rates of wages and profits, it can be interpreted as one in which the wage-profit relation is settled prior to the determination of prices. Whilst this is correct, ^{in a way} it leaves open the question of the status of

This goes too quickly, for me anyway.

*Where did Ricardo insist that the invariable standard act as money?
He happens to choose gold in Edition 3, but in other editions and
elsewhere he chose other things, including labour at one point.*

such a theory. Taking distribution between classes as its starting point, it isolates itself both from the realities of production and the appearances of exchange. On the former we have already commented, but for the latter Dobb recognises by reference to Nuti (1971) the problems of a theory of distribution and price that settles the level of real wages exogenously. At best we can fall back upon ^{the}undetermined balance of distributional class struggle, and there remains the problem of the distinction between bargaining over money and real wages. Consequently, if the neo-Ricardian theory is to have any relevance for appearance (i.e. bourgeois reality) it must introduce from outside theories of class struggle and of money. Surely, in the former case at least, this should then be the starting point for analysis, and not some external intervention?

Interestingly Ricardo, precisely because of the contradiction between the bourgeois and scientific elements of his theory, did not face these problems. His search for an invariable standard of value that would also act as money "gold considered as a commodity produced with such proportions of the two kinds of capital as approach nearest to the average quantity employed in the production of most commodities"⁸ -- "solved" the problem of the dichotomy between money and real wages. The current use of the Sraffian standard commodity divorces its use as standard of value from its use as money. The standard commodity is a hypothetical construct showing ex post the relationship between wages and profits, but it cannot serve in a theory of wage determination as the focus of distributional class struggle because wages are not paid in bundles of the standard commodity⁹. In Ricardo, the problem of wage determination as well as the level of prices was also solved endogenously by the pace of accumulation, the productivity of agriculture at the margin, the historically determined level of subsistence and the ability to

substitute manufactures for corn in the wage bundle¹⁰.

Dobb views neo-Ricardianism as the theoretical obstacle to the degeneration of economic theory into demand analysis and its accompanying neo-classical methodology. As I have observed elsewhere--Fine (1975)--, this is like considering a bridge an obstacle in crossing a river. The very objects of neo-Ricardianism and neo-classicism are the same -- to replace the first approximation of the labour theory of value with the higher order determination of price by exchange relations. This first sally into the realm of appearance by neo-Ricardianism cuts off its retreat into a theory of production, since it rejects value theory, but it opens up for consideration the multifarious influences on price through supply and demand. Why should we consider a cost of production theory the logical anti-thesis to neoclassical demand theory unless we accept the neoclassical division of the economic into a general structure and equilibrium of supply and demand?

Dobb (1973) unwittingly provides two pieces of evidence to confirm this view. First, he observes that the political economy of John Stuart Mill forged a link between the political economy of Ricardo and the principles of the marginalist revolution. This is despite Mill's belief that he was Ricardian through and through. Second, and closer to home, Dobb discusses Kalecki's theory of monopoly price in the context of the close of the neo-Ricardian system. Whilst Dobb does not commit himself to support Kalecki, he recognises that his theory involves the rejection of the abstraction of perfect competition between capitals and the calculation of the degree of monopoly by the aggregation of the monopoly powers of individual firms as determined by the individual demand curves. Let not the intervention of monopoly conceal the movement towards the neoclassical

theory of supply and demand and the accompanying focus on individual economic units.

II. The Value of Political Economy

"In so far as ideas are being confronted with problems, and, problems are formulated (whether implicitly or explicitly, and if not directly at least indirectly) with reference to potential activity, the process of critique and development can hardly fail to be influenced by the social milieu (or reference-point within the complex of social relations)." (Dobb (1973)).

Maurice Dobb for many years held a unique position in the complex of social relations. A Marxist scholar in a field and environment of study dominated by bourgeois ideology, his potential activity was narrowly defined by the social milieu. On the one hand, he could attempt to force a wedge of criticism into the theories of his colleagues but on terms defined by them. On the other hand, he could appeal directly to the working class by producing popular and radicalising pamphlets¹¹. In either case, the contradictory Ricardo-Marx theory of value provides the basis for a critique of capitalism and its economic theory. As a result we owe Dobb a debt for upholding a socialist tradition of thought in universities and the labour movement at a time when it could have become extinguished.

Consciously or not then (and the evidence is that Dobb fails to distinguish Marx and Ricardo adequately) Dobb was forced into a position of Ricardianism which ultimately began to give way to neo-Ricardianism. But what is the radicalising role of neo-Ricardianism in the current period?

There is no doubt that in recent years neo-Ricardianism has been the rallying call of radical economic theorists. This is due to its

devastating critique of the neo-classical one sector growth model. All the well-worn cliches of neo-classical theory concerning the relationship between the value of capital and the rate of profit are shown to be false. Most significantly marginal productivity alone is found to be an inadequate basis for a theory of distribution. Perhaps the neatest summary of the Cambridge critique is that knowledge of technology available and technique in use is insufficient to determine distribution. A typical neoclassical response to this result would be that equilibrium (and distribution) are determined by the conditions both of supply and demand. This leaves the neoclassical theory resting upon exogenously given initial endowments (and aggregated individual preferences), an unsatisfactory situation for two related reasons. First, the distribution of income associated with factor rewards fails to distinguish different sources of revenue. Admittedly, wages are the price of labour (sic), but rent and profit are indistinguishable. This was recognised by Marshall in his discussion of the quasi-rent on the existing capital stock. Once we have a theory of distribution based on initial endowments, those endowments are indistinguishable from non-reproduced factors of production (such as land). This leads to the second failing of the neoclassical theory of general equilibrium. It neither has anhistorical nor an economic explanation of initial endowments. Even if the former deficiency is cast aside as lying outside the bounds of the subject matter of economics, the non-correspondence between the value of the existing capital stock and its cost of reproduction is a deficiency that is highlighted by the very title of Sraffa's book -- Production of Commodities By Means of Commodities. The capital stock has had an historic cost: should this not bear some relation to its future remuneration? Of course, we should not allow the neoclassicist to push his starting-point for initial endowments back a finite number of periods into the past. The question still

(including the previous page)

All this needs much more explanation. Especially the last sentence, where I don't see how aggregated preferences of individuals are relevant to what you've just said about the historic cost of capital.

I cannot see how neo-Ricardianism can offer anything different from neo-classicism since there is no essential difference between them.

remains of the historic cost of that historic capital stock. Nor should we allow the starting-point to be pushed into the infinite past as in neoclassical balanced growth theory¹². Here the social rate of discount surreptitiously acts as surrogate for the aggregated preferences of individuals.

In short, neo-Ricardianism destroys the one-sector first approximation of neoclassical theory, and pushes it back to reliance upon general equilibrium theory¹³. This, in turn, can be criticised for its limited economic and historic scope as a theory of distribution. In contrast, neo-Ricardianism can offer distributional class struggle as the means of closing the system and this is an added radical attraction. As we have already observed, like the neoclassical system's use of demand theory, this closes the system by introducing an element external to the theory. Further, the ultimate neo-Ricardian criticisms of general equilibrium theory can be made quite independently of the criticisms of the one-sector model that may have motivated them. Finally, the neo-Ricardian theory of the supply (I hesitate to say production) of commodities by means of commodities (see what I mean) can be seen to be a logical reconstruction of neoclassical production theory on a sounder basis. This leads to an assessment of neo-Ricardianism as a logically limited radicalising school of thought.

It is also true that neo-Ricardianism has reached the historical limits of its role as radicalising theory. First, the very success of the school has been based upon the growth of Marxist and radical scholars in universities. Second, the affinity between the methods of neo-Ricardian and bourgeois economics has created a school of bourgeois neo-Ricardians. Consequently, third, the development of the neo-Ricardian school will inevitably have the two-fold effect of limiting both the radicalisation of those dissatisfied with neoclas-

sical theory and the development of Marxist political economy among those who are radicalised.

But what role has neo-Ricardianism to play in the field of popular economic polemic? Bourgeois economic ideology plays the most cynical games in times of crisis and recession. For the 1930s, the reality of massive unemployment and idle machinery was accompanied by the theory of the allocation of scarce resources between competing ends. Wage cuts and balanced budgets were the order of the day. In the circumstances, a theory of capitalism that generated the rationale for the demand for employment and no cut in wages, advanced the interests of the working class in theory and practice. Of this neo-Ricardianism is capable. The post-war period has seen the growth of Keynesianism in response to growing state intervention (and not vice-versa). In periods of "prosperity" neo-Ricardianism can justify working class demands for welfare, wages and work. But post-war recessions find the bourgeois theory of the ability to maintain full employment in disarray, even if its policy remedies remain predictably familiar in content. The interests of the working class can only be advanced theoretically by an attack on Keynesianism. Of this, neo-Ricardianism is incapable. As in its theory of distribution, recession has to be explained externally and so some form of Keynesianism is appended, crisis usually arising out of the multiplier effects of the reduced investment that accompanies rising wages. Far from attacking bourgeois theory (except to insist on the need for socialism), this is simply Keynesianism that takes account of the profit motive. So neo-Ricardianism has outlived its usefulness in the theoretical and ideological struggle for socialism.

In this context, how are we to judge Maurice Dobb's contribution to political economy? On the cover of the paperback edition of his

But you yourself have scarcely mentioned it until now. In
 Section I ~~there~~ it's not made clear where the slide from
 Ricardianism to neo-Ricardianism takes place in Dobb's work.

last work, a review from The Times Higher Education Supplement is quoted -- "Mr. Dobb's book presents a magnificent interpretation of the way in which progress does occur in a discipline". This is the opposite of what Dobb has to say of the development of neoclassical economics. The school of neo-Ricardianism to which Dobb moves in later years is a development of the worst elements of Ricardo. It is also a fall from the peak of Dobb's political economy, the regaining of the contradictory position held by Ricardo, the simultaneous commitment to a labour theory of value and a cost of production theory of price.

We have already placed neo-Ricardianism and Dobb's work in an historical and social context. The greatest tribute to be paid to Dobb will come from that Marxist political economy that subjects his work to criticism, just as the greatest tribute to Ricardo comes from Marx's assessment of him as the best bourgeois representative of scientific political economy. The greatest disservice to his work will belong to those who strip from him his commitment to the labour theory of value, the scientific element that moulded his vision and maintained his hold on Marxist analysis on the basis of his political commitment to socialism. Lest the Marxist critique of Dobb generate too much heat, this last aspect of his thought cannot be over-emphasised. It is to his outstanding credit that he could keep his head when the few around him were losing theirs. For him, the transformation problem was "mainly of formal interest" (1955); he rejected the Keynesian and underconsumptionist theories of crises as being as one-sided as distributional theories. The laws of motion of capitalist production as developed by Marx are basic to the majority of his analysis, e.g. Dobb (1928). All of this should be contrasted with the neo-Ricardian school of thought with whom Dobb can be too easily identified¹⁴.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paper to be presented at a Dayschool in Honour of Dobb, January 22nd 1977 at Warwick University. I wish to thank Mike Ball and Laurence Harris for comments.
2. For a criticism of neo-Ricardianism on this basis, see Williams (1975), Kay (1976), Arthur (1976), Gerstein (1967), Fine and Harris (1976), and Pilling (1972) for a specific attack on Dobb.
3. See "The Requirements of a Theory of Value" in Dobb (1973). Rowthorn (1973) shows that neo-Ricardians cannot in fact even reveal a sociology of capitalist exploitation.
4. Samuelson's commitment to the first approximation of the neo-classical one sector growth and the history of the debate over capital theory would suggest that he is not as intellectually ingenious as he would claim.
5. For example, Morishima (1973), Steedman (1975) and Steedman and Hodgson (1975) who would have the labour theory of value collapse because of the existence of joint production and fixed capital.
6. See Colletti (1972).
7. For a survey of neo-Ricardianism and its modern critics see Fine and Harris (1976).
8. Quoted in Dobb (1973, p.83), who in Sraffian style essentially ignores until later the problem of numeraire contained in the first four words.
9. The argument in the last few paragraphs owes much, although this may not be clear, to discussions with Ferry Kemali about idealisational assumptions (see Nowak (1973)).
10. It would be natural, but incorrectly neo-Ricardian, to interpret Marx's transformation of values into prices as a theory of value before distribution, and a theory of distribution before price. This is true of "before" in terms of exposition and determination, but these concepts in Marx bear no relation to the concepts of approximation and causation under consideration here. Rather the capitalist economy is seen as an integrated structure of production, distribution and exchange relationships, for which the latter are the form of appearance of the former. Consequently, and this is obvious to the proverbial child, production before distribution, and distribution before price are senseless idealisations of the capitalist economy. See the Grundrisse, p.99. Recent consideration of Marx's transformation have seen it as an integration of production and distribution -- Baumol (1974), of production and exchange -- Gerstein (1976), and of production, distribution, and exchange -- Fine and Harris (1976).
11. See Hobsbawm (1967).
12. This is a bit like explaining the origin of the species by arguing that humans give birth to humans. This argument has a good pedigree, even if it is absurd. See Marx (1971). I am grateful to David McLellan for this reference.

Footnotes (cont)

13. Although this has received much less attention, the Cambridge critique invalidates most neoclassical econometric work that uses aggregate production functions. It is necessary to estimate general equilibrium systems.
14. The object of this essay has almost entirely restricted it to "static" considerations (revolving around the concept of value, the structure of the capitalist economy and the transformation problem). As we have argued, it is to Dobb's credit that he has never reduced crisis to underconsumption or distributional struggle. Nevertheless, his Ricardian method forces him to see the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall as a completion between tendencies and counter-acting tendencies (1937), rather than as an analysis of the internal contradictions between the two. Neo-Ricardians take the same approach and this is the reproduction in "dynamics" of their error in "statics" -- the failure to distinguish value from its form and analyse production, distribution and exchange as a contradictory unity. See Fine and Harris (1976) for a survey of these issues.

REFERENCES

(CSEB stands for Bulletin of the Conference of Socialist Economists)

Arthur C.J., "The Concept of Abstract Labour", CSEB 14, October 1976.

Baumol W., 'The Transformation Problem: What Marx Really Meant' Journal of Economic Literature (March). 1974.

Colletti L., From Rousseau to Lenin, London 1972.

Dobb M.H., Wages, Cambridge, 1928

Dobb M.H., Political Economy and Capitalism, Cambridge, 1937.

Dobb M.H., On Economic Theory and Socialism, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

Dobb M.H., Theories of Value and Distribution Since Adam Smith, Cambridge, 1973.

Fine B., 'From Marx to Morishima', CSEB IV.12 (October), 1975.

Fine B. and L. Harris, "Controversial Issues in Marxist Economic Theory", Socialist Register, 1976.

Gerstein I., 'Production, Circulation, and Value: The Significance of the "Transformation Problem" in Marx's Critique of Political Economy'. Economy and Society, 1976.

Hobsbawm E.J., "Maurice Dobb", In Socialism, Capitalism and Economic Growth, Ed. C.H. Feinstein, Cambridge, 1967.

Hodgson G. and I. Steedman, 'Fixed Capital and Value Analysis', CSEB IV.1 (June), 1975.

Kay G., 'A Note on Abstract Labour', CSEB V.13 (February), 1974.

Marx K.H., Karl Marx Early Texts, Ed. D. McLellan, Oxford, 1971.

Morishima, M., Marx's Economics, Cambridge, 1973.

Nowak L., Posnan Studies in the Philosophy of Science, June 1975.

Nuti M., "Vulgar Economy in the Theory of Income Distribution", Science and Society, Spring 1971.

Pilling G., 'The Law of Value in Ricardo and Marx', Economy and Society, Vol.1, No. 3 (August), 1972.

Rowthorn B., 'Vulgar Economy', CSEB II.5 (Spring), 1972. Reprinted in New Left Review 86, 1974.

Samuelson P., Collected Economic Papers Vol. I, Ed. J. Stiglitz, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.

Samuelson P., "Insight and Detour in the Theory of Exploitation", Journal of Economic Literature, March, 1974.

Steedman L., 'Positive Profit and Negative Surplus Value', Economic Journal (March), 1975.

Williams K., 'Facing Reality - a Critique of Karl Popper's Empiricism', Economy and Society, 4.3 (August), 1975.